

Advisory Committee, (3) Interfacing with other Province Advisory Committees, (4) Development of action plans for 6 major issues identified during the May '95 meeting, (5) Public participation to be available between 3:20 p.m. and 3:50 p.m., (6) Agenda for next meeting. All Northwest Sacramento Province Advisory Committee meetings are open to the public. Interested publics are encouraged to attend.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Direct questions regarding this meeting to David E. Howell, Designated Federal Official, Northwest Sacramento Province, U.S.D.I., Bureau of Land Management, 2550 North State Street, Ukiah, CA 95482-3023, (707) 468-4000, or Duane Lyon, Province Coordinator, U.S.D.A., Shasta-Trinity National Forests, 2400 Washington Avenue, Redding, CA 96001 (916) 246-5499.

Dated: July 5, 1995.

**David E. Howell,**

*Designated Federal Official, Northwest Sacramento Province.*

[FR Doc. 95-17098 Filed 7-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-FK-M

**Natural Resources Conservation Service**

**Jonathan Davis Wetland Restoration, Jefferson Parish, LA**

**AGENCY:** Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA (Formerly Soil Conservation Service).

**ACTION:** Notice of a finding of no significant impact.

**SUMMARY:** Pursuant to Section 102(2)(C) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; the Council of Environmental Quality Guidelines (40 CFR part 1500); and the natural Resources Conservation Service Guidelines (7 CFR part 650); the Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, gives notice that an environmental impact statement is not being prepared for the Jonathan Davis Wetland Restoration Project, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Donald W. Gohmert, State Conservationist, Natural Resources Conservation Service, 3737 Government Street, Alexandria, Louisiana 71302, telephone (318) 473-7751.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The environmental assessment of the federally assisted action indicates that the project will not cause significant local, regional, or national impacts on the environment. As a result of these findings, Donald W. Gohmert, State

Conservationist, has determined that the preparation and review of an environmental impact statement are not needed for this project.

This plan proposes to reduce wetland loss on approximately 7,200 acres of intermediate marsh in Jefferson Parish, Louisiana. Project measures include 1,000 linear feet of rock weirs, 1,215 linear feet of plugs, 670 linear feet of channel breach armoring, and 34,000 linear feet of shoreline stabilization.

The Notice of a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been forwarded to the Environmental Protection Agency and to various Federal, State, and local agencies and interested parties. A limited number of copies of the FONSI are available to fill single copy requests at the above address. Basic data developed during the environmental assessment are on file and may be reviewed by contacting Donald W. Gohmert.

No administrative action on implementation of the proposal will be taken until 30 days after the date of this publication in the **Federal Register**

Dated: June 29, 1995.

**Donald W. Gohmert,**

*State Conservationist.*

[FR Doc. 95-16834 Filed 7-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3410-16-M

**DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**Foreign-Trade Zones Board**

[Order No. 746]

**Grant of Authority; Establishment of a Foreign-Trade Zone, New London, CT**

Pursuant to its authority under the Foreign-Trade Zones Act of June 18, 1934, as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) adopts the following Order:

Whereas, by an Act of Congress approved June 18, 1934, an Act "To provide for the establishment \* \* \* of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes," as amended (19 U.S.C. 81a-81u) (the Act), the Foreign-Trade Zones Board (the Board) is authorized to grant to qualified corporations the privilege of establishing foreign-trade zones in or adjacent to U.S. Customs ports of entry;

Whereas, the New London Foreign-Trade Zone Commission (the Grantee) has made application to the Board (FTZ Doc. 59-93, 58 FR 65157, 12/13/93) requesting the establishment of a foreign-trade zone in New London,

Connecticut, within the New London Customs port of entry; and,

Whereas, notice inviting public comment has been given in the **Federal Register** and the Board has found that the requirements of the Act and Board's regulations are satisfied with regard to proposed Site 1 (State Pier), and that approval for this site is in the public interest;

Now, therefore, the Board hereby grants to the Grantee the privilege of establishing a foreign-trade zone, designated on the records of the Board as Foreign-Trade Zone No. 208, at the State Pier site (Site 1) described in the application, subject to the Act and the Board's regulations, including Section 400.28.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 26th day of June 1995.

**Ronald H. Brown,**

*Secretary of Commerce, Chairman and Executive Officer.*

[FR Doc. 95-17042 Filed 7-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

**International Trade Administration**

[A-421-803]

**Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From The Netherlands; Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review**

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of Preliminary Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** In response to a request by the respondent, the Department of Commerce (the Department) has conducted an administrative review of the antidumping duty order on *Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products From the Netherlands* (A-421-804). The review covers one manufacturer/exporter of the subject merchandise to the United States during the period of review (POR) August 18, 1993 through July 31, 1994.

We have preliminarily determined that sales have been made below the foreign market value (FMV). If these preliminary results are adopted in our final results of administrative review, we will instruct U.S. Customs to assess antidumping duties equal to the difference between the United States price (USP) and the FMV.

Interested parties are invited to comment on these preliminary results.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 12, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Helen Kramer or Robin Gray, Office of

Agreements Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20230, telephone: (202) 482-0405 or (202) 482-0196, respectively.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Background

On July 9, 1993, the Department published in the **Federal Register** (58 FR 37199) the final affirmative antidumping duty determination on Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands, for which we published an antidumping duty order on August 19, 1993 (58 FR 44172). On August 3, 1994, the Department published the notice of "Opportunity to Request an Administrative Review" of this order for the period August 18, 1993 through July 31, 1994 (59 FR 39543). One respondent, Hoogovens Groep BV (Hoogovens), requested an administrative review (59 FR 39543). We initiated the administrative review for the period August 18, 1993 through July 31, 1994, on September 8, 1994 (59 FR 46391). The Department is now conducting this review in accordance with section 751 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (the Tariff Act).

##### Applicable Statute and Regulations

Unless otherwise indicated, all citations to the statute and to the Department's regulations are references to the provisions as they existed on December 31, 1994.

##### Scope of the Review

The products covered by this review include cold-rolled (cold-reduced) carbon steel flat-rolled products, of rectangular shape, neither clad, plated nor coated with metal, whether or not painted, varnished or coated with plastics or other nonmetallic substances, in coils (whether or not in successively superimposed layers) and of a width of 0.5 inch or greater, or in straight lengths which, if of a thickness less than 4.75 millimeters, are of a width of 0.5 inch or greater and which measures at least 10 times the thickness or if of a thickness of 4.75 millimeters or more are of a width which exceeds 150 millimeters and measures at least twice the thickness, as currently classifiable in the Harmonized Tariff Schedule (HTS) under item numbers 7209.11.0000, 7209.12.0030, 7209.12.0090, 7209.13.0030, 7209.13.0090, 7209.14.0030, 7209.14.0090, 7209.21.0000, 7209.22.0000, 7209.23.0000, 7209.24.1000, 7209.24.5000, 7209.31.0000,

7209.32.0000, 7209.33.0000, 7209.34.0000, 7209.41.0000, 7209.42.0000, 7209.43.0000, 7209.44.0000, 7209.90.0000, 7210.70.3000, 7210.90.9000, 7211.30.1030, 7211.30.1090, 7211.30.3000, 7211.30.5000, 7211.41.1000, 7211.41.3030, 7211.41.3090, 7211.41.5000, 7211.41.7030, 7211.41.7060, 7211.41.7090, 7211.49.1030, 7211.49.1090, 7211.49.3000, 7211.49.5030, 7211.49.5060, 7211.49.5090, 7211.90.0000, 7212.40.1000, 7212.40.5000, 7212.50.0000, 7217.11.1000, 7217.11.2000, 7217.11.3000, 7217.19.1000, 7217.19.5000, 7217.21.1000, 7217.29.1000, 7217.29.5000, 7217.31.1000, 7217.39.1000, and 7217.39.5000.

Included in this review are flat-rolled products of nonrectangular cross-section where such cross-section is achieved subsequent to the rolling process (*i.e.*, products which have been "worked after rolling")—for example, products which have been bevelled or rounded at the edges. Excluded from this review is certain shadow mask steel, *i.e.*, aluminum-killed, cold-rolled steel coil that is open-coil annealed, has a carbon content of less than 0.002 percent, is of 0.003 to 0.012 inch in thickness, 15 to 30 inches in width, and has an ultra flat, isotropic surface. These HTS item numbers are provided for convenience and Customs purposes. The written description remains dispositive.

The POR is August 18, 1993, through July 31, 1994. This review covers sales of cold-rolled carbon steel by Hoogovens.

##### United States Price

The Department used exporter's sales price (ESP) and purchase price, as defined in section 772 of the Tariff Act. ESP was based on the packed, delivered price to unrelated purchasers in the United States after further manufacturing. We made adjustments, where applicable, for foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, brokerage and handling, U.S. inland freight, U.S. duty, commissions to unrelated parties, U.S. credit, discounts, billing adjustments, warranties and technical service expenses and packing expenses incurred in the United States, and indirect selling expenses (which include inventory carrying costs, other U.S.-incurred selling expenses, and export selling expenses). We also adjusted ESP for value added in further manufacturing, including an allocation of profit earned on U.S. sales. On April 28, 1995, Hoogovens submitted, at the Department's request, minor corrections

to the ESP sales listing and further manufacturing cost data. However, this submission also included the breakout of two new model numbers. Further manufacturing costs were not provided for these two new models. To calculate further manufacturing costs for these models, we are using for purposes of the preliminary determination, as the best information available ("BIA") (pursuant to section 776(c) of the Act) the maximum further manufacturing costs provided by Hoogovens for secondary merchandise. See *Analysis Memorandum to the File, May 26, 1995*.

The purchase price sales were based on the sales price to the first unrelated purchaser in the United States. We made adjustments to purchase price, where appropriate, for foreign post-sale inland freight, foreign inland freight, ocean freight, marine insurance, brokerage and handling, U.S. duty, U.S. inland freight, discounts and billing adjustments.

We also adjusted USP (purchase price and ESP) for value-added taxes (VAT) in accordance with our practice as outlined in *Silicomanganese from Venezuela, Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 59 FR 55439, November 7, 1994.

No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

##### Foreign Market Value

Based on a comparison of the volume of home market and third country sales, we determined that the home market was viable. Therefore, in accordance with section 773(a)(1)(A) of the Tariff Act, we based FMV on the packed, delivered price to unrelated purchasers and related purchasers (where an arm's-length relationship was demonstrated) in the home market.

Based on a review of Hoogoven's submissions, the Department determined that Hoogovens need not report its home market sales made by related parties to the first unrelated party (downstream sales), because Hoogovens' downstream sales were only a small portion of the company's reported home market sales.

Hoogovens sold a small quantity of secondary subject merchandise in both the United States and home markets. In this review, the Department compared prime merchandise sold in the United States to prime merchandise sold in the home market, and secondary merchandise to secondary merchandise. In cases where a contemporaneous match for U.S. sales of secondary merchandise could not be found in the home market, the Department used the constructed value for prime merchandise to calculate FMV.

We made adjustments, where applicable, for post-sale inland freight, inland insurance and for home market direct expenses for credit, warranties and technical services. We also made adjustments for discounts and rebates. We adjusted for VAT in accordance with our practice as outlined in various determinations, including *Silicomangane from Venezuela; Final Determination of Sales at Less Than Fair Value*, 59 FR 55435, 55439 (November 7, 1994).

In addition, for comparison to ESP sales, we adjusted FMV for indirect selling expenses (which include inventory carrying costs and other selling expenses) in the home market, limiting the home market indirect selling expense deductions by the amount of indirect selling expenses incurred in the United States. The deduction from FMV for home market indirect selling expenses was limited by the amount of the enhanced U.S. indirect selling expense, in accordance with section 353.56 (b)(2) of the Department's regulations. In cases where a commission was granted on the U.S. sale only, we increased the amount classified as U.S. indirect selling expenses by the amount of the U.S. commission for comparison to home market indirect selling expenses. Also, after deducting home market packing, we added to FMV packing expenses incurred in the Netherlands for U.S. sales.

We also adjusted for differences in physical characteristics. In calculating these differences, we adjusted the costs that Hoogovens had reduced for secondary merchandise so that they equalled those of prime merchandise. See *IPSCO v. United States*, 965 F.2d 1056, 1060 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

For comparison to purchase price sales, pursuant to section 773 of the Tariff Act, we added to FMV, where applicable, U.S. packing, credit, and warranty expenses.

No other adjustments were claimed or allowed.

#### Preliminary Results of Review

As a result of our comparison of USP to FMV we preliminarily determine that the following margin exists for the period August 18, 1993 through July 31, 1994:

Manufacturer	Margin (percent)
Hoogovens .....	3.81

Interested parties may request disclosure within 5 days of the date of publication of this notice and may

request a hearing within 10 days of publication. Any hearing, if requested, will be held 44 days after the date of publication or the first business day thereafter. Case briefs and/or written comments from interested parties may be submitted no later than 30 days after the date of publication. Rebuttal briefs and rebuttals to written comments, limited to issues raised in those comments, may be filed not later than 37 days after the date of publication of this notice. The Department will publish the final results of these administrative reviews including the results of its analysis of issues raised in any such written comments or at a hearing.

The Department shall determine, and the Customs Service shall assess, antidumping duties on all appropriate entries. Individual differences between the USP and FMV may vary from the percentages stated above.

Furthermore, the following deposit requirements will be effective for all shipments of the subject merchandise entered, or withdrawn from warehouse, for consumption on or after the publication date of the final results of this administrative review, as provided for by section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act. A cash deposit of estimated antidumping duties shall be required on shipments of Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands as follows: (1) The cash deposit rates for the reviewed company will be those rates established in the final results of this review; (2) If the exporter is not a firm covered in this review, or the original less-than-fair-value (LTFV) investigation, but the manufacturer is, the cash deposit rate will be the rate established for the most recent period for the manufacturer of the merchandise; and (3) If neither the exporter nor the manufacturer is a firm covered in this review, the cash deposit rate will be 20.19 percent. This is the "all others" rate from the LTFV investigation. See *Antidumping Duty Order and Amendments to Final Determinations of Sales at Less Than Fair Value: Certain Hot-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products and Certain Cold-Rolled Carbon Steel Flat Products from the Netherlands*, 58 FR 44172 (August 19, 1993).

This notice also serves as a preliminary reminder to importers of their responsibility under 19 CFR 353.26 to file a certificate regarding the reimbursement of antidumping duties prior to liquidation of the relevant entries during this review period. Failure to comply with this requirement could result in the Department's presumption that reimbursement of

antidumping duties occurred and the subsequent assessment of double antidumping duties.

This administrative review and this notice are in accordance with section 751(a)(1) of the Tariff Act (19 U.S.C. 1675(a)(1)) and 19 CFR 353.22.

Dated: July 5, 1995.

**Susan G. Esserman,**

*Assistant Secretary for Import Administration.*

[FR Doc. 95-17043 Filed 7-11-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3510-DS-P

[A-580-008]

#### Color Television Receivers From the Republic of Korea; Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review

**AGENCY:** Import Administration, International Trade Administration, Department of Commerce.

**ACTION:** Notice of Amended Final Results of Antidumping Duty Administrative Review.

**SUMMARY:** On September 27, 1993, the Department of Commerce (the Department) published the final results of the eighth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on color television receivers (CTVs) from the Republic of Korea (Korea) (58 FR 50333). The review covered the period April 1, 1990, through March 31, 1991. On July 5, 1994, the Court of International Trade (CIT) ordered the Department to recalculate the adjustment for taxes forgiven on CTVs manufactured by Samsung Electronics Corp. (Samsung) and exported to the United States. On December 28, 1994, the CIT affirmed the Department's recalculations. Since the CIT's ruling was not appealed, we are amending our final results of the eighth administrative review of the antidumping duty order on CTVs from Korea with respect to Samsung.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** July 12, 1995.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Joseph Hanley or Zev Primor, Office of Antidumping Compliance, Import Administration, International Trade Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, 14th Street and Constitution Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20230; telephone: (202) 482-5253.

#### SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

##### Scope of the Review

Imports covered by this review include CTVs, complete and incomplete, from the Republic of Korea. This merchandise is currently classified